

**REMARKS**

This reply is fully responsive to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated 17 AUGUST 2006, and is filed within one month following the mailing date of the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment. The Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed. The method of payment and fees for petition fee due in connection therewith is enclosed.

**Disclosure/Claims Status Summary:**

The amendment document filed on 31 JULY 2006 has been carefully reviewed in light of the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment of August 17, 2006. The Examiner stated that the amendments to the claims were considered non-compliant because each claim has not been provided with the proper status identifier, and as such, the individual status of each claim cannot be identified.

**Claims Non-Compliant Amendments**

In the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment, the Examiner stated that the amendment document filed on 31 JULY 2006 is considered non-compliant because it has failed to meet the requirements of 37 CFR 1.121 or 1.4.

In particular, the Examiner stated that the amendments to the claims were considered non-compliant because each claim has not been provided with the proper status identifier, and as such, the individual status of each claim cannot be identified. The Examiner stated that the status of every claims must be indicated after its claim number by using one of the following status identifiers: (Original), (Currently Amended), (Canceled), (Previously Presented), (New), (Not Entered), (Withdrawn), and (Withdrawn-Currently Amended). The Examiner further stated that the term "Previously Amended" used by the Applicants on the previous Office Action response is not a proper status identifier, and

that Claims 15 and 16 should be labeled as “Original” claims since the Examiner believes that no amendments have been done to Claims 15 and 16.

**Regarding the status identifier of Claims 1-16**

5 The Applicants thank the Examiner for pointing out the discrepancies on the status identifier of the amended claims that were previously submitted by the Applicants.

Regarding the Examiner’s statement that the term “Previously Amended,” as used by the Applicants in Claims 1 and 7 of the previous Office Action, is not a proper status  
10 identifier, the Applicants have replaced the “Previously Amended” identifier in Claims 1 and 7 with the proper status identifier “Previously Presented” in order to meet the requirements of 37 CFR 1.121 or 1.4. Furthermore, the Applicants have corrected the status identifiers of Claims 1-6, and 8-14 by replacing all the “Currently Corrected Dependency” identifiers, with the proper status identifier “Currently Amended,” in order  
15 to correct the claim dependency and to meet the requirements of 37 CFR 1.121 or 1.4.

Furthermore, with respect to the Examiner’s statement that Claims 15 and 16 should be labeled as “Original” claims since the Examiner believes that no amendments have been done to Claims 15 and 16, the Applicants refer the Examiner to the previously amended  
20 claims submitted with the Office Action response dated January 3, 2006, where Claims 15 and 16 were added to the original list of claims. In the response dated January 3, 2006, Claims 15 and 16 were identified as “New” claims. Therefore, the Applicants submit that Claims 15 and 16 are not “Original” claims and that Claims 15 and 16 should now be identified as “Previously Presented” claims.

25 Please note that a newly proposed list of claims containing corrections to the status identifiers of Claims 1-16 has been provided above to satisfy the requirements of 37 CFR 1.121 or 1.4, and that these corrections to the status identifiers of Claims 1-16 do not affect the scope of the claims.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter the Claim Listing as set forth above. The Applicants believe this new set of listed claims reflect the proper claim status identifiers, the correct claim numbering, and the correct claim dependencies.

Thus, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide for timely allowance  
5 of the pending claims.

**Closing Remarks:**

The Applicants respectfully submit that, in light of the above remarks, the application and all pending claims are now in allowable condition. Therefore, reconsideration is  
5 respectfully requested. Accordingly, early allowance and issuance of this application is respectfully requested.

Any claim amendments that are not specifically discussed in the above remarks are not made for patentability purposes, and it is believed that the claims would satisfy the  
10 statutory requirements for patentability without the entry of such amendments. Rather, these amendments have only been made to increase claim readability, to improve grammar, and to reduce the time and effort required of those skilled in the art to clearly understand the scope of the claim language. Furthermore, any new claims presented  
15 above are of course intended to avoid the prior art, but are not intended as replacements or substitutes of any cancelled claims. They are simply additional specific statements of inventive concepts described in the application as originally filed.

Further, it should be noted that amendment(s) to any claim is intended to comply with the requirements of the Office Action in order to elicit an early allowance, and is not  
20 intended to prejudice Applicant's rights or in any way to create an estoppel preventing Applicant from arguing allowability of the originally filed claim in further off-spring applications.

In the event the Examiner wishes to discuss any aspect of this response, or believes that a  
25 conversation with either Applicant or Applicant's representative would be beneficial, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required or  
30 credit overpayment to the attached credit card form. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition

Reply to Office Action of August 18, 2006

to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed. The petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 50-2738 if a credit card form has not been included with this correspondence, or if the credit card could not be charged.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

9/18/06

Cary Tope-McKay  
Registration No. 41,350

Cary Tope-McKay  
TOPE-MCKAY & ASSOCIATES  
23852 Pacific Coast Highway #311  
Malibu, CA 90265  
Tel: 310-589-8158  
Mobile: 310-383-7468  
Fax: 310-943-2736  
E-mail: cmckay@topemckay.com